DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 285 231 CS 505 676

AUTHOR Sullivan, Patricia A.
TITLE Campaign 1984: Geraldine Ferraro vs. the Catholic Church and One Master Motive.
PUB DATE Feb 87
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association (58th, Salt Lake City, UT, February 14-17, 1987).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Abortions; *Catholics; Codes of Ethics; *Discourse Analysis; Females; Males; Moral Values; Political Attitudes; *Political Campaigns; *Political Candidates; *Political Issues; Presidential Campaigns (United States); Rhetorical Criticism; Sex Differences; Social Problems
IDENTIFIERS Burke (Kenneth); *Catholic Bishops; Catholic Church; *Ferraro (Geraldine); Gilligan (Carol); Rhetorical Stance

ABSTRACT

The discord between the Catholic Church and its followers in the United States crystallized with the candidacy of Geraldine Ferraro for vice president in 1984, when she became the target of attacks by members of the church hierarchy. Ferraro questioned why she was singled out on the abortion issue, and indeed, at times she seemed to be running against Archbishop O'Connor and other ecclesiastical authorities who challenged her pro-choice position. Through discourse appealing to tradition and authority, members of the Church hierarchy created a legitimate place for themselves on the political stage. This argument from authority--based on Kenneth Burke's "one master motive"--implied that the pro-life stance was not open to argument. The Church's monolithic position as defender of God's divine plan placed Ferraro in double bind situation when she personalized the abortion issue. However, evaluation of the standards by which she was measured indicate that conflicts between the two sides represented fundamental differences in female and male visions of morality, inherent in the discourse's narrative patterns. Psychologist Carol Gilligan has proposed questioning the standards by which women are evaluated as decision makers and problem solvers, arguing for a "post conventional" ethical system that would integrate an alternate vision of moral development. Two different versions of moral decision making emerge in the discourse generated by Ferraro and the Church hierarchy, differences that should encourage critical exploration of fundamental questions about communication as it relates to female and male constructions of reality. (NKA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

ED285231

CAMPAIGN 1984: GERALDINE FERRARO VS. THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND ONE MASTER MOTIVE

Presented at Western Speech Communication Association Convention 1987
Salt Lake City

by

Patricia A. Sullivan
Assistant Professor
Speech Program/Department of English
Seattle University
Broadway and Madison Avenues
Seattle, WA 98122

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Patricia A. Sullivan

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS505676

ABSTRACT

CAMPAIGN 1984: GERALDINE FERRARO VS. THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND ONE MASTER MOTIVE

This paper examines the pro-choice controversy which raged during the 1984 political campaign. More specifically, this study concentrates on Geraldine Ferraro as a target for attacks by members of the Catholic Church hierarchy. In her autobiography, Ferraro questions why she was "singled out in the abortion issue." I do not attempt to account for why Ferraro was "singled out." Rather, my analysis proposes that through their narrative patterns, Ferraro and members of the Church hierarchy offered competing visions of history as it relates to moral decision making. First, I discuss competing visions of morality which emerged in the discourse. Kenneth Burke's concept of "one master motive" frames my discussion. Next, with the help of Carol Gilligan's theories, I explore competing visions of morality as illustrative of differences in female and male constructions of reality. Finally, I concentrate on implications for research and recommend that feminist critics question narrative theories based on androcentric constructions of reality.

Campaign 1984: Geraldine Ferraro Vs. the Catholic Church and One Master Motive

"America's 53 million Catholics are increasingly going their own way."[1] Recently they have questioned Church doctrines, particularly concerning issues of sexual morality. During campaign 1984, Geraldine Ferraro expressed her pro-choice position and polls demonstrated that Catholics, even those who attend Church regularly, are split concerning a constitutional amendment banning abortions. While the pro-choice controversy raged during the campaign, Catholics were interviewed for a New York Times/CBS news poll, which was conducted in September, 1984. One woman, for instance, commented: "I don't think the Church should have a say in it."[2] She further remarked that if she became pregnant and lacked the resources to raise a child, she might have an abortion "even though it is against my religion."[3]

Such a statement reflects the discord that exists between members of the Church hierarchy and their American followers. This discord became crystalized through Ferraro's candidacy, as she became the target for attacks by members of the Church hierarchy (supported by groups such as the Christian Moral Government Fund). In her autobiography, Ferraro questions why she was "singled out in the abortion issue."[4] Additionally,

she notes that she was surprised by "the depth of the fury" which surrounded her candidacy. She comments:

> But what I wasn't prepared for was the depth of the fury, the bigotry, and the sexism my candidacy would unleash. I didn't expect the antiabortion protests to be so vicious, to be politically orchestrated and funded on the national level. . . . And I certainly did not anticipate that the Archbishop of New York would step out of his spiritual pulpit into the partisan political ring. I was running not only against Reagan, but, as many tried to insinuate, against my own Church as well. [p. 212]

John Herbers, a reporter for the New York Times, was equally surprised by the partisanship of the bishops and noted that in the past "the U.S. Catholic Conference, composed of 300 bishops, had carefully refrained from elevating any concern that could be interpreted as support for any candidate."[5] Furthermore, as Ferraro mentions in her autobiography, Bishop James Timlin of Scranton attacked her for her pro-choice position, but later commented to the Village Voice that he had not used the same criteria to scrutinize politicians representing his own state. He had no idea what positions the two Republican U.S. senators from Pennsylvania or the governor of that state held concerning abortion (p. 228).

This study will analyze the discourse generated by Ferraro and the Church hierarchy. In her autobiography, Ferraro suggests that "we all lost the possibility of constructive dialogue" (p. 239). She also notes that "on the front pages of the newspaper were the predictable pictures of me and the Archbishop

[John O'Connor] seemingly opposing candidates for political office" (p. 231) Indeed, Ferraro did seem to be running against O'Connor and other members of the Church hierarchy who challenged her pro-choice position. How did the Church hierarchy enter the campaign drama? Obviously, Ferraro was a legitimate candidate for political office. However, through discourse which made strong appeals to tradition and authority, members of the Church hierarchy created a legitimate place for themselves on the political stage. In this paper, I will propose that Ferraro and the Church hierarchy offered competing visions of history as it relates to moral decision making. Hayden White implies that moralizing is inherent within narrativizing.[6] We will discover that two different versions of moral decision making emerge in the narrative patterns of Ferraro and members of the Church hierarchy. First, I will discuss the competing visions of morality which emerged in the discourse. Next I will examine these competing visions of morality as illustrative of differences in female and male constructions of reality. Finally, I will discuss implications for research.

The Church Hierarchy and the Master Motive

In articulating the Catholic position, members of the Church hierarchy asserted the existence of "one master motive prevailing throughout the world."[7] As Kenneth Burke notes:

> For the believer in such a universal scheme of motives may go to many different scenes, each with its own motivational texture, without losing his 'hypostasis,' the sense of his

personal integrity and of the 'real' motivational substratum underlying it.[8]

This belief, which was shared by members of the national audience who supported the Church's pro-life position, framed the discourse of Church authorities. The Archbishop of Boston, Bernard Law, for instance, asserted that abortion is "a primordial sin, a primordial darkness."[9] Within this belief frame, the rights of the fetus, in every case, supersede other considerations. Abortion, according to Archbishop Law, became "the critical issue in this campaign" and he suggested that voters should make this their central concern as they evaluated candidates.[10]

Within this narrative, members of the Church hierarchy spoke with authority. It would not be accurate to suggest that members of the Church hierarchy defended the Church's position. They asserted the Church's position and implied that the truth is self-evident; the pro-life stance is not open to argument. When the argument from authority--based on one master motive--is foregrounded, the Church's position is monolithic. Circumstances in particular situations are irrelevant.

Law, O'Connor, and Timlin argued that Ferraro was targeted for criticism because she had signed a letter circulated by Catholics for Free Choice. According to these members of the Church hierarchy, this letter implied that disagreement exists concerning the Church position on abortion. Archbishop Law summarized what he viewed as the Church position and noted:

> The church's position is monolithic from the prospective of the church. You know about the organization called Catholics for Free Choice. Well that's like saying Catholics for apartheid, like saying Marxists for free enterprise. A Catholic believes as a Catholic, that there is a teaching authority and the teaching authority is quite clear on this issue.[11]

Archbishop Law also suggested that the letter circulated by Catholics for Free Choice should be disregarded because they did not have the authority to speak about the Church's position on abortion. According to Law, "the persons who have the right to articulate the church's position are the bishops in union with the Bishop of Rome and that position is unambiguous, consistent, and monolithic."[12] In other words, only individuals in privileged ecclesiological positions have the right to comment on Church matters.

Inherent within this version of history, according to the Church, are appeals to another type of authority--natural law. Through evocation of the principles of natural law, members of the Church hierarchy depersonalized their statements; they spoke for a greater truth. Within this version of the way things are and the way they will be, members of the Church hierarchy have the license to mingle state and Church concerns. Members of the Church hierarchy presented themselves as the guardians of God's divine plan and asserted that human beings are bound by principles which guide their conduct on earth.[13] Archbishop Law commented, for instance:

> If what we are talking about is another human being, then we have moved out of the question of free choice and of private morality and we have moved into the legitimate public concern of the state protecting the right of an individual whose right to life is threatened. . . .
>
> If it is that, then it clearly is within not only the competence but the responsibility of the state to respond to a clear and present danger to that individual.[14]

Through such statements, members of the Church hierarchy justified their interference with the political process. Adherence to the divine plan supersedes other considerations. This Catholic intervention in the political process was foreshadowed in Documentation on the Right to Life and Abortion, a statement issued by the National Conference of Bishops in 1974. In this statement, the Bishops proposed:

> We wish to make it clear that we are not seeking to impose the Catholic moral teaching regarding abortion on the country. In our tradition, moral teaching bases its claims on faith in a transcendent God and the pursuit of virtue and moral perfection. . . . We do not ask the civil law to take up our responsibilities of moral teaching, i.e., that abortion is morally wrong. However, we do ask the government and the law to be faithful to its own principles--that the right to life is an inalienable right given to everyone by the creator."[15]

Within this scenario, the guardians of God's divine plan emphasized that their attacks on Ferraro were not personal. Archbishop Law justified the comments directed against Ferraro

by suggesting that Ferraro had gone further in her statements than other Catholic politicians. A statement issued by the National Council of Bishops emphasized that "We do not take positions for or against particular parties or individual candidates in politics."[16] Obviously, it was difficult for Ferraro to respond to statements which appealed to "one master motive."

Ferraro's Responses to Appeals to One Master Motive

Appeals to one master motive and its emphasis on depersonalization constrained Ferraro's responses to the Church hierarchy. While the Church hierarchy had evoked natural law and the "universal scheme of motives [which] may go to many different scenes," Ferraro struggled to articulate her position. Because the Church officials not only spoke for, but presented themselves as emobodying God's divine plan, Ferraro was on the defensive. "Defensive," however, may be a misleading term in this context. "Defensive" implies that Ferraro actually engaged in dialogue with members of the Church hierarchy. Rather, I believe she was thwarted in her attempts because she personalized the issue of abortion. She emerged as ineffective when confronted with natural law and the master motive.

From the beginning of the campaign, Ferraro personalized the abortion issue and seemed to insist that no master motive could serve as the umbrella subsuming "many different scenes." After she was nominated, she commented on her philosophy during an interview for Newsweek. She said:

> I could never have an abortion, but I think you have to distinguish between imposing your religious beliefs on someone else and between setting forth priorities for yourself, and I think that there's a difference between the two.[17]

During her first news conference, Ferraro made a similar comment and remarked: "I would never have an abortion because, quite frankly, that would be a child conceived in love."[18] However, she also stated that the choice must be up to women and commented that if she were ever raped she might be less "self-righteous" about abortion.[19] She spoke in the first person during the vice-presidential debate and indicated that "If there comes a time where I cannot practice my religion and do my job properly, I will resign my job."[20]

In other words, Ferraro made it clear that she doubted "one master motive" could go from scene to scene. Furthermore, she assumed that the abortion issue was open to discussion. When Archbishop O'Connor charged that she misrepresented the Church's position, she insisted on contacting him and asking for a clarification of his statement. She assumed that the representative of the divine plan owed her an explanation. Jane Perlez, a reporter for the New York Times, witnessed Ferraro's request and later noted:

> It had been her idea, as she went to church the previous Sunday, to phone the Archbishop for a clarification of what he had said about her. The unusual idea of the Democratic

> Vice-Presidential candidate, a Roman Catholic, calling one of her church's most prominent archbishops in the midst of her election campaign did not faze her.[21]

The reporter went on to explain that when the phone call had not "assuaged the prelate," Ferraro called a press conference and "decided to confront the issue head-on."[22]

When she was confronted with the rhetoric of the divine plan, Ferraro's personal approach to these issues may have seemed ineffectual to many audience members. Furthermore, she may have appeared inconsistent in her assertions throughout the campaign. As we have seen, she presented herself as being in agreement with Church teaching on abortion. Additionally, during the campaign she made references to the Baltimore catechism. She emphasized that the "little blue book" had guided her as a child and still guides her.[23] Emphasizing that she could still recite the questions and answers from the catechism, she commented that the book "set forth the basic Judeo-Christian principle, which is taking care of the most vulnerable in our society."[24] She claimed that these were the principles she had taught her children.

From this perspective, it might be argued that Ferraro seemed to be vacillating--that she did assent to one master motive, but conducted herself otherwise. She seemed to propose one standard of conduct for her personal life in which she assented to one master motive and another standard for her public life in which motives varied from scene to scene. The dual code of morality seemed to put her in a perfect position to be challenged by those who evoked the law.

For example, it is apparent that "a Catholic believes as a Catholic" meant something quite different for Ferraro than it did for members of the Church hierarchy. Members of the Church hierarchy implied that Ferraro was deficient in moral development. Her vision of morality seemed to go beyond "the understanding of rights and rules."[25] As I noted earlier, her position took into account the circumstances of the woman seeking an abortion. She spoke in the first person and indicated that she could envision circumstances when she might violate Church prescriptions concerning abortion. For Ferraro, it seemed perfectly natural to personalize this issue.

It might be tempting to suggest that Ferraro, as well as her female successors on the political stage, should take care to adjust their communication and avoid the personalization of issues. From a hierarchical perspective--based on male constructs--this advice might seem reasonable.

However, I recommend that we evaluate the standards against which Ferraro was measured. Recommendations that Ferraro adjust her communication style are actually recommendations that she adjust her world view or her stories which help her "make sense" out of the world. Women and men may manifest fundamental differences as symbol users because they do not share the same "everyday life-world" or "that province of reality which the wide-awake and normal adult takes for granted in the attitude of common sense."[26] In other words, the conflicts between Ferraro and the Church hierarchy represent fundamental differences in female and male visions of morality. These differences are inherent in their narrative patterns.

With their reliance on "one master motive" as articulated by a "teaching authority," members of the Church hierarchy evoked stories which were quite different from those generated by Ferraro, who seemed to suggest that circumstances would shape motivations as an actor moves from scene to scene. A closer examination of these fundamental differences will not only offer explanations for what happened to Ferraro, the woman who was making history, but will raise questions about the use of male constructs to evaluate discourse. In this examination, the work of psychologist Carol Gilligan may prove helpful.

Gilligan and Women's Moral Development

Gilligan proposes that we should question the standards which have been used to evaluate women as decision makers and problem solvers. Earlier I mentioned that members of the Church hierarchy asserted that "a Catholic believes as a Catholic." They implied that Ferraro's moral reasoning was flawed, since she questioned this absolute statement. Such clashes reflected differences in visions of morality. According to Gilligan, we should recognize that differences in female and male moral development exist and that these differences are valid. She suggests that beginning with Freud, who viewed women as castrated men, women have been relegated to the ranks of the psychologically disabled. Other major theorists, including Erik Erikson and Lawrence Kohlberg, have followed suit. Erikson, for instance, recognized differences in female and male development. However, he based his theory of life-style development on male patterns. Specifically, Erikson recognized

that female identity evolves through interrelatedness or intimacy with others. Development of male identity is associated with independence and separation from others. The male pattern represents the norm in life-cycle development. The need for interrelatedness and intimate attachment is viewed as a hindrance in the emergence of identity. Thus, since this is the female pattern of development, women are classified as psychologically immature. "Identity crisis" is inherent in female development (Gilligan, esp. pp. 6-13).

In Kohlberg's system of moral development, women have similar problems. He comments on the superiority of male problem solving:

> Moving to a perspective outside of that of his society, he identifies morality with justice (fairness, rights, the Golden Rule), with recognition of the rights of others as these are defined naturally or intrinsically. The human's being right to do as he pleases without interfering with somebody else's rights is a formula defining rights prior to social legislation.[27]

In other words, within this theory, men emerge as morally superior because they are able to avoid personalization of the issues and act in accordance with a higher law or principle. This higher law might be equated with "a master motive" which is applicable from scene to scene. Such a formula could also be translated into "a Catholic believes as a Catholic."

Gilligan does not reject this hierarchical pattern of moral development. Rather, she argues for a "post conventional" ethical system which would consist of "an integration of rights

and responsibilities through the discovery of the complimentarity of these views" (p. 100). When Ferraro's statements are framed in accordance with a "post conventional" ethical system, they do not seem inadequate.

Ferraro and Moral Decision Making

The clashes between Ferraro and the Church hierarchy exemplify the polarized ethical system rejected by Gilligan. When Ferraro's definition of "a Catholic believes as a Catholic" differed from that of her adversaries in the Church, she personalized her definition and proposed that the Golden Mean or one master motive might bend from scene to scene in accordance with circumstances. On the campaign trail, she did mention hypothetical dilemmas and placed herself in these dilemmas (i.e., as a rape victim, she might be less self-righteous about abortion). Gilligan summarizes this approach and says:

> The proclivity of women to reconstruct hypothetical dilemmas in terms of the real, to request or to supply missing information about the nature of the people and the places where they live, shifts their judgment away from the hierarchical ordering of principles and the formal procedures of decision making. This insistence on the particular signifies an orientation to the dilemma and to moral problems in general that differs from any current developmental stage descriptions. [pp. 100-101]

In her autobiography, Ferraro mentions Gilligan's work and proposes that women have "added another dimension to the

political process."(p. 57) Ferraro does not analyze her own campaign in light of Gilligan's theories. However, she does comment on the particular sets of circumstances which shaped her pro-choice position. Indeed, she maps her pattern of moral decision making. She recounts particular cases she witnessed as head of the Special Victim's Bureau in the Queens County District Attorney's Office. In her discussion, she emphasizes that she was not guided by principle as she "was weighing" her position on abortion" (p. 216). She recounts her experiences with rape victims and says:

> I could still hear the voice of a six-year-old girl who had been so brutally raped by a neighbor that she spent two weeks in the hospital for vaginal repair. Later, on the witness stand, she screamed in terror when I asked her to describe to the grand jury what had happened when the rapist took her into the bushes. To comfort her while she continued testimony, I had to hold her in my arms as she spoke to the jury.
>
> Another victim, a thirteen-year-old girl from an Irish Catholic family, had been dragged up to the roof of her building and raped by a big, heavyset kid. She was totally traumatized. If that young girl had become pregnant, who was I--or the Church--to tell her she had to have that child? I wasn't about to make that decision for her. It should be up to her and her family. [p. 216]

Ferraro notes that she "dealt" with "many rape victims" and comforted women who had experienced "the ultimate violation of

self" (p. 216) For Ferraro, "a Catholic believes as a Catholic" was inadequate as she weighed her position. In other words, Ferraro did not articulate her experiences in Church terms. In Gilligan's words, Ferraro delineated "in women's own terms the experience of their [her] adult life" (p. 173).

This delineation of experience in her own terms, the personalization of issues, meant Ferraro was placed in double bind situations. When evaluated in accordance with male constructs--the law or one master motive--Ferraro's statements seemed inadequate. Because she violated the Golden Mean, crowds often met her with "Ferraro, what kind of Catholic are you?" (Ferraro: My Story, p. 218) In her autobiography, Ferraro says, "I thought then, and still do, that my decision was morally right" (p. 218). However, as a reader I sense that Ferraro might agree with Gilligan's assessment of women who find themselves in these double bind situations. Gilligan comments:

> The image of drifting along or riding out recurs throughout the interviews to denote the experience of women caught in the opposition between selfishness and responsibility. Describing a life lived in responsibility, guided by the perception of others' needs, they can see no way of exercising control without risking an assertion that seems selfish and hence morally dangerous. [p. 143]

Indeed, Ferraro was bound to be viewed as the loser when her statements were evaluated in accordance with authority. She refused to evoke authority and insisted that her experiences suggested that moral decision making went beyond the law. These

observations concerning Ferraro's candidacy have implications for future research.

Moral Decision Making and Women's Discourse: Implications for Research

This analysis proposes that feminist critics need to examine the male constructs upon which we rely. Earlier I mentioned that it would be tempting to encourage Ferraro to adjust her discourse. A reliance on androcentric rhetorical approaches might suggest that Ferraro simply erred in her analysis of a rhetorical situation. In other words, a critic might recommend that Ferraro and future women candidates should avoid personalization of the issues. For example, Ferraro might have chosen to counter Church authorities and their appeals to "one master motive prevailing throughout the world" with appeals to an alternative "one master motive prevailing throughout the world." Church officials legitimated their claims through the evocation of a teaching authority which has its foundation in natural law. When Church officials suggested that the right to life is an inalienable right granted by God, Ferraro might have legitimated her claims and suggested that free choice is an inalienable right granted by teaching authorities (authors of The Declaration of Independence and The Constitution) in American culture. Clearly, recommendations could be made for readjustment in Ferraro's discourse.

However, I hesitate to make such recommendations. My analysis proposes that two different versions of moral decision

making emerge in the discourse generated by Ferraro and members of the Church hierarchy. These differences should encourage critics to explore fundamental questions about communication as it relates to female and male constructions of reality. As critics, we often assume that "Humans enjoy and perhaps need the comfort and order of a history."[28] Such an assumption is probably warranted, but we do need to examine whether "the comfort and order of a history" means the same to women and men. My analysis, of course, suggests that these definitions differ. Such differences indicate that rhetorical scholars need to examine their operating assumptions when they analyze public moral arguments, for instance.[29]

Recently, much critical attention has been focused on "the role of stories in human discourse and as the paradigmatic model of human communication."[30] However, feminist critics must examine the roots of the narrative paradigm and question which constructions of reality are being foregrounded in the narrative paradigm. I do not believe the narrative paradigm goes beyond other rhetorical frameworks and liberates us from androcentric approaches to criticism. Rather, I propose that critics who have embraced the narrative paradigm are relying on "habits and categories developed by [those] inherited interpretive traditions."[31]

NOTES

[1] Elaine Sciolino, "American Catholics: A Time For Challenge," The New York Times Magazine, 4 November 1984, p. 40.

[2] Quoted in John Herbers, "Catholic Activism: Reasons and Risks," The New York Times, 23 September 1984, Sec. E, p. 25.

[3] Herbers, p. 25.

[4] Geraldine A. Ferraro, with Linda Bird Francke, Ferraro: My Story (New York: Bantam, 1985), p. 227. Subsequent page numbers will be cited in the text.

[5] Herbers, p. 25.

[6] Hayden White, "The Value of Narrativity in the Representation of Reality," in On Narrative, ed. W.J.T. Mitchell (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980), p. 23.

[7] Kenneth Burke, A Grammar of Motives (1945; rpt. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969), p. 44.

[8] Burke, p. 44.

[9] Quoted in John Herbers, "Abortion Fight Likened to Battle on Civil Rights," The New York Times, 23 September 1984, Sec. A, p. 15.

[10] Herbers, "Abortion Fight Likened to Battle on Civil Rights," p. 15.

[11] "On the Record: Boston Prelate on the Issue of Abortion," from an interview with Archbishop Bernard F. Law of Boston, The New York Times, 23 September 1984, Sec. A, p. 15.

[12] "On the Record: Boston Prelate on the Issue of Abortion," p. 15.

[13] For an analysis of Church arguments from authority concerning the birth control debate, see Karen A. Foss, "Singing the Rhythm Blues: An Argumentative Analysis of the Birth-Control Debate in the Catholic Church," Western Journal of Speech Communication 47 (Winter 1983), 29-44.

[14] "On the Record: Boston Prelate on the Issue of Abortion," p. 15.

[15] National Conference of Catholic Bishops, Documentation on the Right to Life and Abortion (Washington, D.C.: United States Catholic Conference, 1974), p. 2.

[16] "Text of Bishops' Statement on Role of the Church in Politics," The New York Times, 14 October 1984, Sec. A, p. 13.

[17] "Ferraro on Ferraro," Newsweek, 23 July 1984, p. 25.

[18] Quoted in Jane Perlez, "Ferraro the Campaigner." The New York Times Magazine, 30 September 1984, p. 92.

[19] Quoted in Perlez, p. 92.

[20] From a videotape of the vice-presidential debate, recorded October 11, 1984.

[21] Perlez, p. 22.

[22] Perlez, p. 22.

[23] Perlez, p. 90.

[24] Perlez, p. 90.

[25] Carol Gilligan, In A Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development (1982; rpt. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1983), p. 19. Subsequent page numbers will be cited in the text.

[26] Alfred Schutz and Thomas Luckmann, The Structures of the Life World, trans. Richard M. Zaner and H. Tristram Englehardt, Jr. (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1973), p. 3.

[27] Lawrence Kohlberg, "Continuities and Discontinuities in Childhood and Adult Moral Development Revisited," in Collected Papers on Moral Development and Moral Education, Moral Education Research Foundation, Harvard University, 1973, pp. 29-30. Quoted in Gilligan, p. 20.

[28] Celeste Michelle Condit, "History and Rhetoric: The Rhetorical Histories of the Abortion Controversy," paper presented at the 1985 Speech Communication Association Convention, p. 20.

[29] See, for example, Walter R. Fisher's "Narration as a Human Communication Paradigm: The Case of Public Moral Argument," Communication Monographs 51 (March 1984), 1-22 and "The Narrative Paradigm: An Elaboration," Communication Monographs 52 (December 1985), 347-367.

[30] See Homo Narrans: Storytelling in Mass Culture and Everyday Life, A Symposium, Journal of Communication 35 (Autumn 1985), 73-171.

[31] Fredric Jameson, The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act (1981; rpt. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1983), p. 9.